

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

QUINTARA BIOSCIENCES, INC.,

Plaintiff,

No. C 20-4808 WHA

v.

RUIFENG BIZTECH INC., et al.,

Defendants.

**ORDER RE MOTION FOR
PROTECTIVE ORDER AND
RE SEALING REQUESTS**

A prior order directed plaintiff to disclose its asserted trade secrets before it would be permitted discovery. Plaintiff did so and then served several discovery requests. Defendants again move to halt discovery, rating the disclosure deficient (Dkt. Nos. 40, 50).

It is time for the parties to graduate from tee-ball. The prior order barred discovery until plaintiff served a “satisfactory statement” of the asserted trade secrets. If defendants believe the disclosure unsatisfactory, they may refuse discovery and move to strike the trade secret claims. *See, e.g., JobScience, Inc. v. CVPartners, Inc.*, No. C 13-04519 WHA, 2014 WL 1724763 (N.D. Cal. May 1, 2014). If they prevail, we may bless their refusal. If plaintiff prevails, we will likely extend discovery.

This order also notes that defendants have facially oversealed the instant motion, redacting *every page of the body* of the brief. *Both* parties shall please take a careful look at our local rules and circuit precedent and then reevaluate their *and each other’s* requests to seal.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 22, 2020.



WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE